

year, and already the competition is fierce among candidates for election to "Safire's New Political Dictionary: The Definitive Guide to the New Language of Politics." Accordingly, Mr. President, I have the honor to propose as first-in-the-field, a remarkable triple-hyphenated safe bet and sure winner from the new year's day editorial of the Washington Post entitled, appropriately enough, "The New Year." The editorial looked back to its predecessor 50 years ago, when the Post editorial writer of that age, contemplating the end of the Second World War, pondered whether the United Nations might now bring peace on Earth. This year's editorial comments, "That sort of world-federal-ish talk seems almost quaint today." Indeed, it does. Cord Meyer apart, there are not likely to be as many as half a dozen Americans alive who remember the World Federalists and their unflinching attachment to world government. That, of course, is just the role editorials play in our lives; to remind us of forgotten fancies and dashed dreams, lest we become too much impressed with the wonders of our own age.

Mr. President, I can report that Mr. Safire, interviewed by telephone in his posh Washington offices, readily concurred that "world-federal-ish" was definitely an early starter for this year's pol-lexigraphic race, adding that it might prove a watershed compound and go on to win a triple crown.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER FOR RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, may I inquire, what is the current status of the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business has expired.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to extend the time of morning business for an additional 10 minutes, and that I be permitted to speak during that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, could I suggest to my colleague that we extend it until 2 o'clock with Members allowed to speak therein for 10 minutes?

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I have been informed that it is the leader's intention to go into recess subject to the call of the Chair immediately after my statement.

Mr. SARBANES. There is a Member on our side who actually has left his office and is on his way to the floor, and

we would like for him to have 10 minutes.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I think we have an agreement here that we would extend the period of time for morning business by 20 minutes, with 10 minutes allocated to this Senator and 10 minutes allocated to the Senator from Arkansas, as given by the Senator from Maryland. If that is acceptable, I so ask unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. And thereafter, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the Senate go into recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

#### TIME TO BALANCE THE BUDGET

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I have come for the first time to a disturbing conviction. That conviction is that I do not believe this budget process is going to succeed. I am beginning to believe that any amount of negotiating in the future is not going to result in agreement. I have come to this point because 44 days after the President said he agreed that we should enact a balanced budget, nothing has happened, and I am not sure that negotiating and bargaining is being done in any way that would fulfill that commitment.

The President, first of all, has not demonstrated any history of supporting or proposing a balanced budget and has yet to put a balanced budget as scored by the agency that he insisted it be scored by, on the table.

He has vetoed the only real budget that has come before his desk, and even now, today, January 4, as I said, 44 days after he agreed to enact a balanced budget, he has yet to propose a balanced budget. President Clinton has now proposed four budgets, none of which has produced a balance. The third so-called balanced budget he proposed was scored by the Congressional Budget Office as \$200 billion per year over balance as far as the eye could see, and then his fourth budget only managed to reduce the deficits to \$100 billion a year for every year ad infinitum.

Not one Member of the Senate, Republican or Democrat, has voted for the President's budget. In one vote, it was defeated 96 to nothing, in another 99 to nothing. So this is just not Republican rhetoric. This is a unanimous

rejection of the President's attempts to balance the budget by all Republicans and all Democrats in the Senate.

So for anybody who is under the illusion that the President has proposed a balanced budget with honest numbers, no one in this body, Republican or Democrat, agrees to that.

It seems to me, third, that at every stage of the negotiations the President has purposely tried to distract the Nation's attention from a balanced budget.

First, he talked about the number of years it would take to balance the budget and finally agreed, under duress I think, that 7 years would be the right number. But he was quoted as saying, and I quote again, "[As President] I would present a 5-year plan to balance the budget." He said that on Larry King in June.

And then in July, he said, "But I do not believe it is good policy, based on my understanding of this budget—which is pretty good, now—to do it in 7 years." That he said in a Rose Garden ceremony in July.

Then he said, well, I think we ought to "balance the budget in 10 years. It took decades to run up the deficit, it's going to take a decade to wipe it out." That was during his Presidential address to the Nation.

Then he used the scoring issue, that is, determining whether or not the numbers were real, as a distraction. He challenged us—and I sat over at the House of Representatives during his State of the Union Address—when he said, "Let's at least argue about the same set of numbers so the American people will think we are shooting straight with them." That was in his address before a joint session of Congress on administration goals in February 1993.

And so we accepted that challenge, and we said we will agree, Mr. President; let us use the agency that you want to use. That is the Congressional Budget Office. And then we argued back and forth, back and forth, and the President said, well, the Congressional Budget Office, I do not agree with them. I wish to use my own numbers.

For nearly 9 months he was able to distract the press, the Congress, and the American people from the real issue of balancing the budget by focusing the debate on how long it ought to take, on what numbers we ought to use. So he—I have to give him credit—he masterfully maneuvered and shifted the debate for month after month after month when the real issue was balancing the budget.

The President's attitude is particularly destructive because we are at a unique moment in recent history. We have the opportunity to pass a real balanced budget, interestingly enough, at a time when the differences between us are not that great. We have a chance to negotiate because really we are quite close. A number of Democrats have worked with Republicans in trying to put together an alternative budget